

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-17, which were all of the then pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the prior art, principally U.S. Patent 6,834,297 (Peiffer, et al.). More specifically, Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Peiffer, et al. in view of a document "Web Workshop Javascript" (Lemay, et al.); and Claims 5, 10 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over Peiffer, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,163,780 (Ross).

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11 and 14 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. Also, claim 16 is being cancelled to reduce the number of issues in this case.

For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1-15 and 17 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow these claims.

The present invention, generally, provides methods and systems to download reduced size files over computer networks. These files are of the type that includes both renderable and non-renderable source code in a scripted language format.

In accordance with the invention, a web browser at a client computer asks a server computer for a file. In response to this request, the server reduces the size of the requested file, and then downloads that reduced size file to the browser. The size of the file is reduced by removing pre-identified subject matter, including both renderable and non-renderable source code from the file. A number of specific steps may be taken to remove matter. For example, duplicate logic blocks may be consolidated, unused logic blocks may be removed, and recurring identifiers may be shortened.

The references of record, including Peiffer, et al, Lemay and Ross, do not teach the principal of reducing the size of a web content file by, in response to a request for the file from a client browser, removing from the file pre-identified, renderable and non-renderable source code in a scripted language, and while maintaining the page layout of the file.

Peiffer, et al. discloses a method and system for removing non-renderable data from a web resource, thereby creating a modified web resource. The procedure of the present invention removes scripting language, which is more complicated than the tagged language removed in Peiffer, et al. Because of this, the present invention may be used to consolidate duplicate logic blocks, shorten recurring identifiers, and remove unused logic blocks. Peiffer, et al. does not address any changes to logic blocks. In addition, identifiers are not a part of tagged languages and are not mentioned in Peiffer, et al.

As the Examiner has recognized, Peiffer, et al. fails to disclose a number of important features of the preferred embodiment of the present invention. For instance, Peiffer, et al. does not disclose, among other features, removing pre-identified subject matter in a scripted language, or that this removed subject matter may be unused logic blocks.

In order to overcome these deficiencies of Peiffer, et al. as a reference, the Examiner relies on Lemay and Ross.

Lemay is a book on working with Javascript. The Examiner has cited specific portions of Lemay, including page 227, line 10 to page 229, line 9 for its disclosure of several Javascript features. It is important, though, that these features of Lemay are not used to remove source code from a text file. Lemay, in contrast, teaches how to use Javascript to add graphics – not how to remove script language while maintaining the page layout.

Ross describes procedures for condensing computer code. This reference works with byte code, while the present invention works with source code. Byte code is the highest level of abstraction, while source code is the human readable code. In addition, the source code, when modified by the present invention, does not require re-compiling, while the modified byte code of Ross does need to be recompiled. Ross and the present invention thus address very different situations and provide solutions for different specific problems.


Claims 1, 6 and 11, which are all independent claims, describe important features of the invention that are not shown in or suggested by Peiffer, et al, Lemay or Ross. In particular, each of these claims describes the feature that the requested web content file stores information including renderable and non-renderable source code in a scripted language format, and that the size of the file is reduced, while maintaining the page layout format of the requested file, by removing pre-identified subject matter including both renderable and non-renderable source code in that scripted language.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest these features described in Claims 1, 6 and 11.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 17 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith. In addition, Claims 7-10 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 12-15 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 11.

In view of the above-remarks, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow these claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 7472-4343

JSS:jy